

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected. With this amendment, claims 1-25 are canceled, and new claims 28-55 are added. Claims 26-27 were previously withdrawn.

### **Drawings**

In the Office Action the drawings were objected to and corrected drawings were requested. Enclosed with this amendment are corrected formal drawings and a letter to the Official Draftsman.

### **Amendment to the Title**

In the Office Action, the title was objected to. With this amendment the title has been amended to be more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action, claims 3, 4-6, 7, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action stated that the meaning of the term “complimentary” is unclear.

With this Amendment, claims 3, 4-6, 7, and 23 have been canceled. However, the term “complementary” is used in new claims 32, 33, 36 and 37. In these new claims, the typographical error has been corrected to clarify that the ports are “complementary” as opposed to “complimentary.” The meaning of this term is defined in the specification, for example at page 12, lines 13-18, which explains that ports are complementary if they are inverse versions of the same service protocol. Specifically, a complementary port to a service provider port is a service consumer port having the same service protocol. Similarly, a complementary port to a service consumer port is a service provider port having the same service protocol. Since the term “complementary” is defined in the specification, claims 32, 33, 36, and 37 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 5 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to claim a useful function. With this amendment, claim 5 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Template Software Inc. With this amendment, claims 1-25 have been canceled.

**New Claims**

With this amendment, new claims 28-55 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that new independent claims 28 and 49, and dependent claims 29-48 and 50-55, are allowable over the prior art.

One of the features presented in new independent claim 28 is a system development tool for defining component instances, configuring component instances, and defining links between component instances, all without requiring writing of additional code. As described in the specification, for example at page 5, lines 2-6, systems of the prior art utilize components as application parts that are glued together by application code. The present invention does not require complex glue code. Instead, an engine software program provides a run-time environment which supports communication between component instances.

Template Software Inc. does not disclose, teach, or suggest a system development tool for defining component instances, configuring component instances, and defining links between component instances, without requiring writing of additional code. Therefore, independent claim 28 is allowable.

Independent claim 49 presents additional features of the present invention that are unknown in the prior art. For example, claim 49 includes an engine software program to provide a programmable run-time environment for hosting the plurality of component instances and

implementing the links to provide bi-directional communication paths between the plurality of component instances.

Prior systems, as described above, required glue code to connect components and make them function. Communication between components was hard coded into a monolithic application. The present invention provides a benefit over the prior art in that this coding is not required. Instead, the engine software provides a programmable run-time environment for hosting the component instances. In addition, communication between component instances is implemented by the engine software at any location where a link is defined in the system development tool. In other words, a domain expert/user does not need to write code, but rather can simply place links between components to define a bi-directional communication path. The bi-directional communication path is then implemented by the engine software.

Template Software Inc. does not disclose, teach, or suggest an engine software program to provide a programmable run-time environment for hosting the plurality of component instances and implementing the links to provide bi-directional communication paths between the plurality of component instances. Therefore, independent claim 49 is allowable.

Claims 29-48 and 50-55 depend from allowable independent claims 28 and 49 respectively and are therefore allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, this application containing pending claims 28-53 is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

9/8/04

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047

THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING

312 South Third Street

Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002

Telephone: (612) 339-1863

Fax: (612) 339-6580

DRF:BAT:bmg